



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,532	12/28/2000	Stephen S. Ing	PM 027 1632 P9889	6957

7590 09/26/2003

Pillsbury Madison & Sutro LLP
Intellectual Property Group
Ninth Floor, East Tower
1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3918

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/750,532

Applicant(s)

ING ET AL.

Examiner

Phuong N. Hoang

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Claims 1 – 4, 6, 8 – 14, 16 – 21, 23 – 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman, US patent no. 6,594,692.

As to claim 1, Reisman teaches a plugable call control application program interface, comprising:

a base plugable call control application program interface (generic API 86, col. 28 lines 13 – 20) to expose a common set of function calls, properties, and callbacks to be utilized by a plurality of call control protocols (direct dial-up communication, online access, col. 35 lines 55 – col. 36 line 10); and

an extended application program interface (third-party API, col. 28 lines 58 – 65) to provide at least one of advanced function calls, properties, and callbacks beyond the common set (direct dial-up communication, online access, col. 35 lines 55 – col. 36 line 10).

As to claim 2, Reisman teaches the plugable call control application program interface according to claim 1, further including:

a platform isolation layer (protocol plug-in, col. 28 lines 58 – 65) having a reduced set of basic system functionality to interact with the base plugable call control application program interface and the extended application program interface; and

a software application (Internet Applications, col. 36 lines 24 - 65) executing on a communications system that accesses the base pluggable call control application program interface to initiate a communication utilizing one of the plurality of call control protocols.

As to claim 3, Reisman teaches the pluggable call control application program interface according to claim 2, wherein the communications system is a computer system (computer, col. 36 lines 24 - 65).

As to claim 4, Reisman teaches the pluggable call control application program interface according to claim 2, wherein the communications system is an embedded system (embeddable, col. 31 lines 55 – col. 32 line 10).

As to claim 6, Reisman teaches the pluggable call control application program interface according to claim 1, wherein the call control protocols are Internet Protocol (IP) telephony call control protocols (Internet TCP/IP protocols, col. 60 lines 5 – 12).

As to claim 8, Reisman teaches the pluggable call control application program interface according to claim 1, wherein the at least one of advanced function calls, properties, and callbacks provide additional protocol-specific functionality to at least one of the plurality of call control protocols (Recursive Updating of the Transporter, col. 29).

As to claim 9, Reisman teaches the pluggable call control application program interface according to claim 1, wherein the at least one advanced function calls, properties, and callbacks beyond the common set is accessed using the base pluggable call control application program interface (API 86 and protocol 88 are extended to support extended, open-ended interactive sessions....online chat, col. 28 lines 24 – 65).

As to claim 10, Reisman teaches the plugable call control application program interface according to claim 1, wherein the extended application program interface provides protocol specific information along with base defined callbacks (online chat, col. 34 lines 10 – 30).

As to claim 11, Reisman teaches a method of performing call control on a communications system, the method comprising:

providing a common set of function calls, properties, and callbacks to be utilized by a plurality of call control protocols (protocol plug-in 88, col. 28 lines 12 – 20) ;

providing at least one of advanced function calls, properties, and callbacks beyond the common set (online service with four levels, col. 31 lines 55 col. 32); and

accessing the common set of function calls, properties, and callbacks to initiate a communication utilizing one of the plurality of call control protocols (protocol plug-ins works with API to provide online service 80, col. 28 lines 58 – 65).

As to claim 12, Reisman teaches the method according to claim 11, further including: providing a reduced set of basic system functionality (communication manager, col. 28 lines 15 – 25) to interact with the common set of function calls, properties, and callbacks; and executing a software application on a communications system to access the common set of function calls, properties, and callbacks to initiate the communication utilizing one of the plurality of call control protocols.

As to claim 13 – 14, see claim 3 – 5 above.

As to claim 16, see claim 6 above.

As to claim 17 – 19, see claim 8 – 10 above.

As to claim 20, this is the system claim of claim 11. See claim 11 above for rejection.

As to claim 21, see claim 12 above.

As to claim 23 - 24, see claim 16 - 17 above.

As to claim 25 - 26, see claim 13 - 14 above.

As to claim 27, see claim 18 above.

As to claim 28, see claim 10 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 15, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisman, US patent no. 6,594,692 in view of Sergio, US patent no. 6,195,680.

As to claim 5, 15, 22, Reisman does not teach the plurality of call control protocols include at least one of an International Telecommunication Union (ITU) H.323 protocol, a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP), and a Media Gateway Control Protocol (MGCP).

Sergio teaches the plugable call control application program interface according to claim 1, wherein the plurality of call control protocols include at least one of an International Telecommunication Union (ITU) H.323 protocol (ITU, col. 1 lines 50 col. 2 lines 10, and col. 13 lines 45 – 50).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Sergio to Reisman's system because it provides a standard telecommunication protocol for telephony system.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisman, US patent no. 6,594,692 in view of Bergler, US patent no. 5,572,675.

As to claim 7, Reisman does not explicitly teach the plugable call control application program interface is an American National Standards Institute (ANSI) "C" application program interface.

Bergler teaches the API written in C language (API functions are described in C language function calls, col. 4 lines 25 – 30).

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to apply the teaching of Bergler to Reisman's system to C is a reliable language.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 605-4239. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2126

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)746-7140.

Ph

September 17, 2003.



JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100